

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMME United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/696,266 | 10/29/2003 | Federico J. Benetti | GUID-005DIV6 | 6516 |
| 36154 | 7590 05/18/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| LAW OFFICE OF ALAN W. CANNON | | | O'CONNOR, CARY E | |
| | WOLFE ROAD .E, CA 94086 | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3732 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/18/200 | 5 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | ()x |
|--|--|--|-------------|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/696,266 | BENETTI ET AL | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Cary E. O'Connor | 3732 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a | ppears on the cover sheet wi | ith the correspondence addres | is |
| Period for Reply | N V IO OFT TO EVENE - M | ONTHO: FROM | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt and will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tute, cause the application to become AB | reply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this commus BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | nication. |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 | February 2005. | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ TI | nis action is non-final. | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allow | · | • | rits is |
| closed in accordance with the practice unde | r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D |). 11, 453 O.G. 213. | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 23-60 is/are pending in the applicat | tion. | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) 39-46 is/are withdr | awn from consideration. | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) <u>23-39 and 47-60</u> is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and | I/or election requirement. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Exami | ner. | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) □ a | ccepted or b) objected to | by the Examiner. | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | - · · | • • | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre | , <u>=</u> | · · | ` ' |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the | Examiner. Note the attached | d Office Action or form PTO-1 | 52. |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreignal All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume | nts have been received. | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr | | | је |
| application from the International Bure | · | · | • |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a li | st of the certified copies not | received. | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | Summary (PTO-413) | |
| Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/C Paper No(s)/Mail Date 120103. | _ | s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152 · |) |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I - Claims 23-38 and 47-60 in the paper filed February 1, 2005 is acknowledged.

Claims 39-46 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the paper filed February 1, 2005.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain <u>a</u> patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer <u>cannot</u> overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 25-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 3, 4, 9-11, 5-7, 12-15 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,673,013. This is a double patenting rejection.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 23, 24, 47-60 and 24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 25, 38, 27-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,673,013. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the instant claims and the claims of the patent lies in the fact that the patent claims include more elements and is thus more specific. Thus, the invention of the patent claims is in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of the instant claims. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species". See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ 2d 2010 (Fed.Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors

Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application
as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29,
2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this
application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the
AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 24 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vierra et al (6,017,304). Vierra shows a device for use in cardiovascular surgery comprising a stabilizing member including at least one contact member 15 adapted to engage a surface of a beating heart, and at least one exposure member 17 operable in concert with the contact member to reposition a portion of the heart.

Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borst et al (5,836,311). Borst shows a device for use in cardiovascular surgery comprising a stabilizing member including at least one contact member 22 adapted to engage a surface of a beating heart, and at least one exposure member 27 operable in concert with the contact member to reposition a portion of the heart (column 6, lines 35-40).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cary E. O'Connor whose telephone number is 571-272-4715. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cary É. O'Connor Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

ceo